

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. Claims 1-10 are allowed and claims 11-20 stand rejected. Claims 1, 11, 21 and 23 are independent claims.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Initially, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-10 are allowable and claims 11-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection. In view of the present amendments to independent claims 11 and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 11-20 is allowable.

Further, Applicant has added new claims 21-24 which are based on subject matter indicated as allowable by the Examiner (see page 3 of the Office Action). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that new claims 21-24 be allowed for the reasons set forth by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action.

**Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 8 and 9 for including minor informalities. By the present Amendment, the minor informalities noted by the Examiner have been corrected. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim objections.

**Specification Objections**

The Examiner has objected to certain language present within the Specification. In particular, the Examiner has objected to language used to characterize the illustrations of Figures 6 and 7. Applicant respectfully traverses this Specification objection.

With respect to Figure 6, the Examiner notes that control circuit 140 shown in Figure 1 receives signals K0, K4 and K8, whereas control circuit 140 of Figure 6 does not appear to receive these signals. Applicant respectfully submits that the signal INL is based on the signals K0, K4 and K8 (e.g., a result of a given logic combination or operation). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Figure 6 is not “misdесcriptive”.

With respect to Figure 7, the Examiner alleges that Figure 7 is misdescriptive because Figure 7 “only shows a summation selection block”, whereas figure 2 shows “THREE least significant blocks” (Page 2 of the Office Action). Figure 2 generally illustrates a block diagram, whereas Figure 7 illustrates a circuit diagram in more detail. In view of the differences of the level of detail between Figures 2 and 7, Applicant respectfully submits that characterizing Figure 7 as illustrating an example implementation of the summation selection unit 150 is not misdescriptive.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the Specification objections.

**35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 11-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner directs the Applicant to the “Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility” dated November 22, 2005. In particular, the Examiner alleges that “since there is no physical transform to establish a practical application, a useful, concrete and tangible result appears to be lacking (see page 3 of the Office Action). For reasons which will now be set forth, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Independent claim 11 is directed to a summation method carry look-ahead addition. Independent claim 11 recites a process where a number of logical operations may be performed

to obtain a value representing the sum of two or more number. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the “useful, concrete and tangible results” change the sums quantity or “final sum result” as recited in independent claim11. It would be appreciated that combining or summing numbers is an incredibly useful tool, and is often executed by processors (e.g., carry look-ahead adders) to perform calculation, execute computer programs, etc.

Applicant refers the Examiner to Annex V, entitled “Mathematical Algorithms”, of the PTO Examination Guidelines. The above cited section states, “[c]ertain mathematical algorithms have been held to be non-statutory because they represent a mathematical definition of a law of nature or natural phenomenon” (see page 59). Applicant respectfully submits that the “final sum result” is neither a mathematical law of nature nor a natural phenomenon. Rather, as claimed, the “final sum result” is a quantified indicator, which is generated in accordance which a number of logical operations. Further, Applicant has amended independent claim 11 to clarify that the method thereof is automated with a carry look-ahead adder.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

Reconsideration and issuance of the present application is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-24 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, Dickey, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

JAC/DAP: tlt